

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 23 Feb 2004 05:13:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Let's talk about the timing of George W. Bush. America gets involved in a bitter war in Viet Nam. The war heats up in 1972. George Bush blows off the last two years of his term of service in the National Guard.

Quote:I didn't say two years. I said between '72 and '73.

Didn't say what? At least be consistent with your own posts, will you? It takes away from your credibility to not pay attention to your past comments when making new ones.

Quote:So, if Bush was present for 1-2 days, that OBVIOUSLY proves that he was there for whenever you say he was.

This isn't like cutting class- if you walk off a base when you're not supposed to, SOMEONE is going to stop you. I don't know how secure things were during Vietnam, but unless you're a relatively high-ranking officer(in which case all they do is look at a sticker on the bumper representing your pay grade), you get checked going in and out. One way of confirming his presence would be to find out if there are any records of who went into or out of that particular post during that time period, and when. If that record doesn't exist, then both arguments are sort of screwed, aren't they?

Quote:A lot of political figures have admitted to doing drugs while they were younger.

Exactly. So it proves nothing to bash a candidate based on past drug use, when so many of our current politicians did drugs as well. If credibility is determined by whether or not someone did drugs, then there's an awful lot of people who you can't trust.

Quote:Thank you.

You're Welcome.

To Llama:

Quote:i still dont understand this whole liberating thing, "fighting for peace is like fucking for virginity" i just dont see how we have the nerve to say we are liberating them when we are dropping bombs on them.

I don't see how any liberation would be possible without removing the oppressive regime that was in power- parts of which are still there, and very determined to not be defeated. For the last fucking time, the US is not targeting the Iraqi citizens, we are targeting the terrorist cells that operate within the country. If a building is destroyed, it is because intel told the military there was enemy activity inside it. If someone gets shot by a US soldier, it is a certainty that that person represented a threat to that soldier or one of his fellow servicemen.

Quote: it would seem we care more about Iraq than our own country . . .

At the moment, we have to. The US is stable; it is not going to collapse. Mass anarchy will not result from putting a little more effort into ensuring stability in Iraq, which WOULD collapse if we were not there supporting it right now.

Quote:which is strange for republicans . . . once again oil comes into play . . . hmmmmm?????

No...no, it doesn't. The USA has more oil in it now than Iraq ever has had, or ever will. If Bush wanted oil, he could have gone drilling up in Alaska like he wanted; bypassing the EPA is a lot less costly than starting a war. Since oil would be about profit, it's quite obvious that starting a war over a reserve which is smaller than our own untapped resources would be pure stupidity. Only you or your fellow oil ranters would even consider such an idiotic possibility.

---